



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,335	10/08/2004	Yugo Matsunaga	259821US0PCT	2012
22850	7590	04/09/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER STOCKTON, LAURA LYNNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/509,335	Applicant(s) MATSUNAGA ET AL.	
	Examiner Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D. (3)_____.

(2) Frederick D. Vastine, Ph.D. {Reg. No. 27,013}. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 02 April 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sorbera et al. {Drugs of the Future, January 2003, Vol. 28, No. 1, pages 26-30} and Nagasawa et al. {US 5,981,557}.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The alleged differences between the instant claimed invention and the prior art was discussed by Dr. Vastine. The Examiner argued that the same compound was being administered to the same patient to treat the same ailments as disclosed in the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Laura L. Stockton/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required